

## REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the above-identified Office Action. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the proposed amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the term "super pure water" or alternatively "ultrapure water" are terms of art which need not be described in detail in the specification. See the articles enclosed in the Appendix attached to this response. As will be noted, there is an American ASTM standard for pure water established by the Electronic Ministry.

"A patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art." *Spectra-Physics, Inc v. Coherent, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 1524, 3 USPQ 1737 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." M.P.E.P. § 2164.01.

It is respectfully submitted that the use of the term "super pure water" should not be taken as rendering the claims vague and indefinite, and must be seen as being a limitation which distinguishes it over lower grades of water quality.

The specification has been amended in light of the Examiner's comments in the parent case relating to the spin coating of tetrafluoroethylene.

Claims 1, 5-6, 8-10 and 12-14 have been cancelled. Claims 2-4, 7 and 11 have been amended to become method claims and to depend from claim 15.

It is submitted that claims define patentable subject matter in that the cited art does not disclose that a resist film containing fluorine is formed on an anti-reflective coating containing fluorine in a manner which promotes adhesion between the two layers.

Should any issues arise that can be expeditiously dealt with telephonically, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the given telephone number.

Date October 2, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Customer Number: 22428  
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (202) 672-5485  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
William T. Ellis  
Registration No. 26,874

Keith J. Townsend  
Registration No. 40,358